**Individuals:** Each and every one of us!

**Groups**: from small local community groups to large high influence big money groups

**Structure:** the map you made of the National, State and Local government or the brochure shared with you earlier in the year i.e. various levels of government.

**Functions:** Refer back to the Preamble as it describes the majority of the functions of our government.

**Evaluate**: verb (used with object), -at·ed, -at·ing.

1. to determine or [set](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/set) the [value](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/value)  or amount of; appraise: to evaluate property.

2. to judge or determine the significance, worth, or quality of; assess: to evaluate the results of an [experiment](http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/experiment).

**What is “shape policy”?**

**How do individuals shape policy?**

**How do groups shape policy?**

**Activity Directions: You will become a critic of how people and groups shape policy.**

**Step one**

Create a table to document your work, use the chart below to get you started. You do need to decide what “Traits” you will be looking for and critiquing.Next, you will find examples of people or groups and describe how they meet these characteristics/traits. Everyone needs to make their own chart in order to work in the group to create the rubric. MAKE SURE YOUHAVE EXAMPLES OF GOOD AND BAD!

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Example (Name) | URL or Source | Trait 1 | Trait 2 | Trait 3 | Trait 4 | Trait 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Traits are the components, characteristics, or **the actions**, as in this case, that can be rated in a rubric. The traits are the parts of the rubric that have different levels where the score is derived.

Sites that have traits broken down that will be helpful:

1. <http://www.eaea.org/index.php?k=12033> (lives of active citizens in Finland)
2. <http://www.thisnation.com/textbook/participants-groups.html>
3. <http://www.thisnation.com/textbook/participants-citizens.html>

Step Two

1. Pair up and take five minutes to share and discuss the merits and problems of two individuals and two groups each from Step One. One example should be a clear example of positive policy shaping and one an example of negative policy making. Discuss specific traits that could be used to evaluate individuals and groups.
2. Write the specific traits down four to eight traits both positive and negative.
3. Join another pair and now, in a group of four, review your lists of traits that were generated in step one. Synthesize the lists to no fewer than four but no more than seven general traits that could be used to evaluate most any web site. As much as possible, make each trait discrete and clear. Combine similar traits. Eliminate redundant, obtuse, or invalid traits.
4. Once you reach consensus on the traits, decide on a numeric scale to use for judging how well a website rates for each of the traits.
5. Brainstorm a list of descriptors that define major point values on the numeric scale. What does a high score, a low score look like?
6. Now that you have all the components for the evaluation rubric, sketch the complete evaluation rubric with a marker on large sheet of paper. Write boldly and large enough for others to read from a distance. Your poster (evaluation tool) will be displayed on a wall.
7. Each person in your group will now individually use this evaluation rubric to evaluate the following site: [www.greenpeace.org](http://www.cheese.com). It is important that you evaluate the site without collaboration or discussion.
8. After all members have had enough time to evaluate, compare how your group members scored [www.greenpeace.org](http://www.greenpeace.org) with each major trait.
9. If someone in the group rated a trait radically different from the rest, ask them to explain why. Can the group persuade the radical, or the radical persuade the group? Is a compromise necessary? Try to reach a consensus score for each trait. Does the tool need to be changed somehow to make it more useful?
10. Decide on a reporter or spokesperson. Display your poster. Have the spokesperson share with the rest of the class how well your group's evaluation tool worked when applied.
11. As a class, synthesize the various evaluation tools into a single rubric. Find what traits are most commonly used. Sometimes groups refer to the same trait using different terminology, so the class must agree on what term to use (a groups' shared understanding of a term is called *nomenclature*).